DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 404 346 TM 026 086

AUTHOR	Newman, Carole; And Others
TITLE	Student-Maintained Portfolios and Peer Mentoring as a Means of Empowering and Motivating Students: Unexpected Outcomes.
PUB DATE	Feb 96
NOTE	21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, February 21-24, 1996).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Attitude Measures; *Elementary School Students; English (Second Language); *Evaluation Methods; Intermediate Grades; Junior High Schools; Junior High School Students; *Limited English Speaking; Longitudinal Studies; *Mentors; *Peer Relationship; *Portfolio Assessment; Portfolios (Background Materials); Qualitative Research; Second Language Instruction; Self Evaluation (Individuals); Student Evaluation; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	Student Engagement

ABSTRACT

The development of oral language and literacy skills and the development of portfolio management strategies to assess these skills is reported. Data are from a longitudinal study involving sixth and seventh grade students in an English as a Second Language (ESL) urban middle school classroom. Portfolios were originally introduced to 13 sixth graders in 1994, and by fall of 1995 the population of the portfolio study had grown beyond the original students of limited English proficiency (LEP) to 30 sixth and seventh grade LEP students. The teacher and researchers collaborated in development an efficient portfolio management system that relied on four management tools: Goal Cards, a time management sheet, a learning log, and a self-evaluation checklist called the Friday Progress Report. The on-site researcher and the teacher maintained journals to record their modifications of the system. An attitude survey completed by students illustrated their views about the process and developing skills. Qualitative evaluation data came from the teacher and researcher, student reflections, teacher observations, and student dialogue journals. Evaluation results indicate that the portfolio management system has been largely successful in helping students become involved and in assessing their progress. (Contains 45 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
CAROLE NEWMAN
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

ED 404 346

STUDENT-MAINTAINED PORTFOLIOS AND PEER MENTORING AS A MEANS OF EMPOWERING AND MOTIVATING STUDENTS: UNEXPECTED OUTCOMES

Carole Newman, Lynn Smolen, Dennis J. Lee, Jr.,
and Victoria Aron
The University of Akron

Presented at the Eastern Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, February 1996, Boston, MA.

TM 026086

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STUDENT-MAINTAINED PORTFOLIOS AND PEER MENTORING AS A MEANS OF EMPOWERING AND MOTIVATING STUDENTS: UNEXPECTED OUTCOMES

Carole Newman, Lynn Smolen, Dennis J. Lee, Jr.,
and Victoria Aron
The University of Akron

Introduction: The current research project presents data from a longitudinal study involving sixth and seventh grade students in an ESL (English as a Second Language) urban middle school classroom. The data focuses on student development of portfolio management strategies and the development of oral language and literacy skills. In addition, seventh-grade students (Fall, 1995) who had one year experience in working with the portfolio were trained to mentor the entering sixth-graders in the process.

Portfolios were originally introduced to the thirteen students who were sixth-graders in this classroom during the Fall of 1994. The portfolios were used to help structure and track student growth and development as self-directed learners as well as their growth and development in the English language. It was believed that once proficient in goal setting and time management, these students could become proactive in making decisions about their learning. They would spend more time on task, and would be more focused and motivated as they identified, tracked and reflected their progress. The researchers also felt that the first-year experiences of these students could then be used during the second year to help children new to the ESL program and to further empower those experienced in the portfolio process.

Subjects: By the Fall of 1995, the population of students involved in the ESL portfolio study grew from 13 limited English proficient (LEP) sixth-graders (1994-95) to 30 sixth and seventh-grade LEP students during the 1995-96 school year. Three of the original 13 sixth-graders moved out of the school system. The 30 students in this classroom came from at least seven cultural and linguistically different backgrounds, including Thailand, Vietnam, Laos, China, Korea, Bosnia, and the Ukraine. The structure of the class is continually changing as new students are added. Many of the sixth-graders have extremely limited English language proficiency and some have little or no formal schooling. The other students have prior school experiences that emphasize teacher directed learning as

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

opposed to student directed learning. They do not have the concept, as demonstrated by their entering behaviors, of self-initiated learning, goal setting, self-reflection or self-evaluation, which are the skills and attitudes integral to the portfolio philosophy and process. It was believed that by developing an efficient system to teach these students how to create and maintain their own portfolios, they would not only improve their proficiency in English, but they would also develop metacognitive and cognitive skills which would help them become self-directed, more motivated and more successful learners. The teacher has a Master's degree in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages and has been teaching for seven years.

Review of Relevant Portfolio Literature: The use of portfolios in the classroom has generated a great deal of interest among educators within the last five years. (Newman, Smolen, & Lee, 1995a; Newman, Smolen, & Lee, 1995b; Paris & Ayres, 1994; Glazer & Brown, 1993; De Fina, 1992; Rief, 1992; Graves, & Sunstein, 1992; Herman, Aschbacher, & Winters, 1992; Tierney, Carter, & Desai, 1991; Aschbacher & Winters, 1992; Tierney, Carter, & Desai, 1991; van Kraayenoord & Paris, 1992; Weeks & Leaker, 1991.) The educational benefits of portfolios and strategies for implementing them into the classroom have been discussed in an number of books and articles (Rief, 1992; Tierney, et al., 1991; Newman & Smolen, 1993; Paris & Ayres 1994; Smolen, Newman, Wathen, & Lee, 1995; Pierce, Bass, Fagan, & Millet, 1995). The 1990's have seen the state-wide mandates and adoption of some form of portfolios in Vermont, Kentucky, and more recently Michigan (Moya & O'Malley,1994; Mills, 1989; Paris & Ayres, 1994), and on a smaller scale, portfolios are being considered and adopted in districts, by schools and by individual teachers as a viable alternative assessment tool (Vavrus, 1990; Hansen, 1992). While we have not reached the level of implementation that has been achieved in New Zealand and Australia, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development has identified portfolios as one of the three current major trends in curriculum development (Mills, 1989; Newman & Smolen, 1993).

One of the major advantages of the portfolio process is that it is a means of empowering students to become active partners and decision makers in their own learning (Newman, Smolen, & Lee, 1995; Newman & Smolen, 1993). A sense of ownership is developed as students help select their goals for learning and the criteria by which they will be judged (Van Kraayenoord, 1993; Vacca & Vacca,

1994; Valencia, 1990). Students are further motivated by their role in making judgments about what to include and by their responsibility for using self-reflection to explain what each piece of work represents in their educational development (McCombs, 1991; Shrunk, 1990).

Another key advantage of portfolios is their value as an assessment tool for the process as well as product of learning. Because the portfolio format lends itself to the inclusion of samples of student work illustrating progress at various points along the path of academic growth, they are better able to document process, which is more reflective of the actual day to day classroom environment. However, concern for the validity and reliability of portfolios as alternative means of assessment has resulted in a body of literature, some of which is the focus of the entire October, 1994, issue of Educational Leadership . Winograd, Paris, and Bridge (1991) argue that traditional tests are misaligned with the literature-based, integrated curriculum of today's classrooms and emphasis on tests may force teachers to abandon their curricular goals to prepare students for skill-based questions. They propose that educators align instruction and evaluation by using authentic assessment such as portfolios.

Celebrating what a student "CAN DO" is another key element of the portfolio philosophy. Students, particularly those who have had limited academic success in traditional norm and criterion referenced evaluation procedures, frequently begin to identify their incremental progress and to view themselves as being capable of achieving an academic goal (Newman and Smolen, 1993). Working from a strength model, rather than the traditional deficit model, students and teacher view the learner in terms of demonstrated academic strengths and personal progress (Colvin, 1988). Information teachers obtain from portfolios should also drive instruction by helping teachers to identify students' needs so they can better match instruction to needs, and assessment to instruction (Rothman, 1988; Calfee & Hiebert, 1987; Shulman, 1987; Wiggins, 1989).

A number of experts have cited management of the portfolio process as a great concern for teachers (Russavage, 1992; Cortez & Lawver, 1993). If implementation becomes too cumbersome for the classroom teacher portfolios will either be abandoned or will be portfolios in name only. Therefore, for the purposes of this research project, the development of an efficient management system for the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

implementation and maintenance of student portfolios was a critical issue.

The efficacy of using portfolios with at-risk students has been documented by French (1992), Pierce, Bass, Fagan and Millet (1995), and others. This assessment is particularly appropriate for ESL students since standardized tests have been found to be inappropriate for determining the real abilities of this population (Navarrete, 1990; Garcia, 1994; Moya & O'Malley, 1994). These tests result in consistently low scores for language minority students and therefore do not inform teachers about strengths on which to build instruction. Second, authentic assessment provides teachers with multiple indexes of the abilities and performance of ESL students (Garcia, 1994). Multiple measures are necessary for estimating a student's multifaceted, encompassing communicative competence, ability to use the competency, and academic proficiency. Therefore, a varied approach to measurement is needed to present a clear picture of student strengths and weaknesses (Moya & O'Malley, 1994). Another strong reason for using portfolios with this population is that the portfolio structure is very flexible and thereby can be adapted to meet the diverse linguistic, cultural and educational needs of ESL students. (Moya & O'Malley, 1994).

In addition, the portfolio process requires students to manage, monitor, and evaluate their own learning. The process is demanding and requires students to develop organizational skills, cognitive skills, and metacognitive thinking that they may not presently have. Teachers need to help stretch students into what Vygotsky (1978) calls their "zone of proximal development"-- the level between where they are presently functioning and their potential level of development. Through modeling, feedback and instruction teachers stretch student performance. The repeated practice of the various tasks involved in maintaining a portfolio, along with the scaffolding provided by the teacher, provides a valuable learning experience which challenges students to stretches as they strive to reach their potential.

Methodology: The classroom teacher and the researchers collaborated in the creation of an efficient portfolio management system that was considered to be functional and not cumbersome. Considerable experimentation through trial and reevaluation resulted in the use of four management tools to initiate the portfolio process. Goal Cards, a Time Management Sheet, a Learning Log and a self

evaluation checklist called the Friday Progress Report were gradually introduced to the class. The researchers viewed these instruments as potential management tools which might encourage self efficacy, goal setting, and self reflection-- three key factors for successful portfolio assessment . During the first year of the project, these tools were developed, modeled by the teacher and a research assistant, and implemented one at a time. They were then practiced repeatedly as they became an integral part of the classroom routine. Analysis of qualitative and quantitative data from year one indicated that the modeling and on-going practice were crucial for successful student use of these tools.

The Friday Progress Report is a student checklist that categorizes all of the student responsibilities in the classroom and provides space for the students to record the completion of their tasks as they finish them, thus shifting the locus of control from the teacher to the students. This tool, designed to facilitate the teacher's ability to keep track of each student's weekly progress, was modified at the beginning of the second year to require daily recording of work completed. Simple directed questions such as, "What do you have left to complete on your checklist?" were used, when necessary to direct students back on task. At the end of the week students evaluated their effort in working to their potential and they wrote a reflective statement explaining their answer. This procedure worked fairly well during the first year, but was not carried out during the first semester of the second year because the classroom teacher believed this task was beyond the extremely limited language and academic skills of a majority of the sixth-grade students. At this point in time, the classroom teacher still feels a majority of her students do not have sufficient skill to complete this task in a meaningful way but she is considering reinstating this for more proficient students.

Since the design of the classroom during the first year allowed students to work independently each day, a time management system was created through teacher/researcher collaboration. At the beginning of the week, students were given a Time Management sheet which listed the days of the week across the top and ten minute intervals along the left side of the page. Prior to the daily class activity of sustained silent reading, five minutes were spent each day to complete the management sheets, giving students a graphic understanding of what they were to be doing during their ESL period. Teacher and student activities were established through

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

dialogue and scheduled on the management sheets. Students filled in "free" blocks of time using the criteria from the Friday Progress Report as tasks that need to be completed. They referred to these blocks as "their" time and often consulted with each other as they decided what they intended to do on that day. During the first semester of the second year of the study, the teacher felt that the limited skills of a majority of the students, resulted in their having "nothing to manage."

To enhance management procedures and prepare students for the self reflection and goal setting inherent in a quality portfolio system, Goal Cards were introduced into the class design during the 1994-95 year. For this task, index cards were distributed weekly in class and the Goal Card process was modeled for the students. On the front of the cards, students wrote goals, usually addressing things that were not accomplished in weeks past. For example, some students wrote that they wanted to get their spelling work completed on time. Others wrote that they wanted to finish a piece of writing and type it on the computer. As the year progressed it became evident that students were writing simplistic goals related to completion of tasks. Two weeks were then set aside to teach how to write more meaningful metacognitive goals related to reading comprehension. Metacognitive reading strategies articulated by students during carefully constructed lessons were written on charts and hung on the walls for easy reference. Students could refer to them to remember what good readers do before, during and after reading, and they became the focus of their goals. After repeated modeling, scaffolding, and practice, several students became more skilled in the process of identifying a strategy they wanted to practice, and this became their stated goal. Consequently, some shift was observed from simple task completion goals to goals which referred to using the identified metacognitive strategies. Students were instructed to place their goal cards on their desks at the beginning of each class period and to refer to them as often as they wished. At the end of the week, they wrote a reflective statement on the back of the card, stating whether or not they accomplished their goals. Goal Cards were graded each week during the first year, according to criteria set by the teacher. During the second year, goal cards were implemented that the end of the first semester. The classroom teacher was hesitant to reintroduce this procedure until more of the students were ready to state their goals, but she decided that students from the previous year could indirectly aid their new peers by modeling the process.

Recognizing the value of a qualitative component, the on-site researcher and the teacher maintained journals in which they recorded their observations, concerns and ideas for modifying the management system. Quantitative data were collected to assess goal setting as it related to student progress, the development of student skills in self evaluation, and teacher and student attitudes and perceptions regarding the value of the portfolio as an assessment tool. Year one of the study collected baseline and posttest data through the student attitude survey, a teacher attitude survey, a cloze test, analyses of student dialogue journals and a story retelling. All posttest student measures, except for the attitude survey, were collected at the end of the school year to validate the use of the portfolio system as an effective tool for guiding student growth. The student attitude survey was administered as a post-test to the ten remaining original group of students, and as a pre-test to the other entering sixth and seventh-graders during the Fall, 1995. Three teacher attitude measures were taken during the 1994-95 year and again during the Fall, 1995.

The attitude survey was used to determine entering student attitudes towards their own goal setting, assuming responsibility for their learning, organizational skills for managing their work, parent involvement, metacognitive strategies for learning, and peer interaction in the learning process. The classroom teacher and the on-site researcher modeled the survey format for the ESL students who had no prior experience with this type of instrument. Because of their limited English proficiency, an interpreter, the classroom teacher, and a researcher attempted to explain survey questions that were confusing to the students, using examples from their daily classroom experiences whenever possible. This process worked fairly well during the first year, but its effectiveness was questionable with the more limited language proficient second group of sixth-graders and with the inability to secure the services of interpreters in all of the students' languages.

Entering proficiency was assessed by a number of measures, including a story retelling, a cloze test, Dialogue Journal entries and a preliminary student interview. The interview provided the teacher with a preliminary view of students' oral language proficiency and background experience. Its primary purpose was to gain some information on students who were new to the school and unfamiliar to the teacher but it was abandoned during the second year because

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of time and language constraints. Because the first year dialogue journals sometimes resulted in student responses such as, "I don't feel like writing today," it was decided to change the task to requesting all students write a story about a picture provided by the researchers. This uniform prompt provided a better basis for comparison between children and for identifying individual growth from beginning to end of year. As in all cases, this new procedure was explained, modeled and practiced before baseline data was collected.

Story retellings were used to determine entering listening comprehension and oral language fluency at the beginning of the school year. Because incremental increases in language proficiency are often small and difficult to assess, this procedure was used again at the end of the school year and at the end of the first semester of the second year of the project, to allow maximum time to assess growth in these areas. The stories for the retellings were chosen from a book of fables. Each child was read a story twice, given time to draw a picture, and asked to retell the story. The retelling responses were rated by the classroom teacher and the on-site researcher using an oral proficiency rating scale developed by Hamayan, Kwiat and Perlman (1985) and a story retelling checklist which measures knowledge of story structure and ability to make inferences, adapted from Irwin & Mitchell's (1983) "A Procedure for Assessing the Richness of Retellings". A video tape of each retelling was also rated by a second researcher who has expertise in the area of ESL methodology and reading. For many of the students new to the program during the second year, their language skills were too limited to allow for responses beyond stating their name and a few minimal answers to some of the questions.

Additionally, a cloze test was used to assess students' reading comprehension. The teacher selected a short, age-appropriate story from a reading magazine specifically published for ESL students, and modified it for this reading assessment. In the cloze procedure a blank line is left every fifth word to determine if the student is able to construct meaning from context. For the purposes of ESL evaluation, blanks are left every seventh or eighth word (Chamot and O'Malley, 1994). The teacher modeled the technique, gave the students practice examples, and read the directions twice. Students were then required to read the story to themselves and fill in the appropriate word whenever they came to a blank line indicating a word had been omitted. A parallel form of the cloze test was

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

developed at the same time to be administered at the beginning and end of the year to measure growth in reading comprehension. The test used during the Fall, 1994, was administered to the Fall, 1995 sixth-graders so that students' entering skills could be compared for the two years. As anticipated, the 1995-96 sixth graders began the year with a much lower level of reading comprehension as measured by the cloze test.

Other indices of English proficiency development included the students' Writing Notebooks, Reading Response Logs, and Dialogue Journals. These provided on-going evidence of student language and literacy growth and attitudes. Students chose pieces from these sources to "publish" (creating a final copy on the computer) and include in their portfolio.

The major change from the first to the second project year was the addition of a ten week component intended to train "experienced" seventh-graders to mentor new sixth-graders in the portfolio process. The ten remaining students from the first year were removed from the classroom during first period to be trained in mentoring techniques by two research assistants. Because the whole class size grew to 37, the teacher was forced to split first period into two separate classes, which necessitated a change in the mentor training. One of the ten original students was also removed from the training because of repeated inappropriate behavior, and new seventh-graders along with two fairly proficient sixth-graders were added to the training, so that there would be a sufficient number of mentors for the large number of mentees.

While students initially felt pride in being selected for "special training," attitudes deteriorated when they were not given class time to actually work on their portfolios or to help other students establish portfolios. The teacher determined that classroom rather than portfolio management was a priority, and mentors were used to help their less proficient classmates attempt the instructional tasks assigned. Mentors saw this as "not learning anything new" and became less enthusiastic as time went on. One student comented, "I hate it a little. I don't really want to help the kids. I don't like to help the kids. I like to learn [then] help the kids." Another said, "I don't like to help the kids anymore. I just want to do my work."

Design/Analysis: A multi-method, quasi-experimental, longitudinal and qualitative research design was developed to guide

this research without unnecessarily complicating the educational environment.

Qualitative data was obtained from the teacher and on-site researcher journals, from student reflective statements, from teacher observations that were triangulated with researcher analysis of taped reading retellings, and from comparing student Dialogue Journals with the journals from a control group of ESL students from the 1993-94 school year (Newman and Benz, 1991). Quantitative data was gathered from a Teacher Attitude Survey, a Student Attitude Survey, an analysis of written fluency , an analysis of portfolio maintenance tasks, and an assessment of entering, year end and second year student skills. Inter-judge reliability estimates were also obtained.

It was determined that baseline information on entering English language proficiency and initial student attitudes needed to be collected as early in the school year as possible to allow a maximum amount of time between pre and post testing. This would increase the likelihood that the researchers would be able to detect changes that might occur. English language proficiency assessment, based on the story retelling, resulted in two measures during the first year for the 1994-95 sixth graders, and one measure during the first semester of 1995-96, for all sixth and seventh graders. An estimate of student listening comprehension was obtained through an evaluation of each student's ability to demonstrate a variety of comprehension skills (identifying main idea, details, sequencing, inferring meaning, relating text to own life, recognizing organization, summarizing, and giving opinions) through the retelling. Their oral responses were also evaluated using an oral proficiency rating scale which measures accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. During the first year, each student's responses were video taped and evaluated by both the teacher and the on-site research assistant and by one of the primary researchers with expertise in ESL and reading. Responses during the second project year were evaluated the researcher who is expert in bilingual education and by a research assistant. Evaluators' ratings were triangulated to determine the degree of inter-judge reliability. On both the listening comprehension and oral proficiency assessment, expert judge agreement was very high.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A cloze test to estimate reading comprehension was administered at the beginning and end of the school year and during the Fall 1995 semester. Gain scores were obtained by comparing correct responses at the two testing points. The readibility level of the Fall cloze test was estimated to be at third grade and the Spring level was estimated to be at fourth grade according to the Fry Readability Graph. A correlation of these results indicated that there was a significant gain in reading comprehension ($p = .005$) as measured by these instruments, over the course of the year for the initial group of students. While we cannot directly attribute this change to the implementation of the portfolios, the researchers believe that portfolios helped to facilitate learning. The students developed the metacognitive strategies necessary to maintain and be responsible for their own work. Furthermore, there appeared to be an increased sense of self-efficacy which resulted in an improved ability to focus on a task and construct meaning. Evaluation of the second year scores is in process, and has the potential of interesting implications since the classroom use of portfolios was delayed until the end of the Fall, 1995 semester.

The students' Dialogue Journals were also evaluated independently by each researcher for on-going evidence of student skill development. The researchers scored three initial entries that seemed representative of the students' proficiency and fluency, three at mid- year, and three from the last two months of school, using a rubric developed by Moya (1990). Possible scores ranged from 0 (no response) to 5 (varied vocabulary, clear meaning, appropriate organization, topic development, etc.) These scores were compared to a control group of six former ESL sixth-graders who had the same teacher the previous year but had no training in the portfolio process.. There was 100% inter-judge reliability in the scoring of the students' writing in both groups. A word count of these entries was also done to determine changes in fluency from the beginning to the end of the year.

A point bi-serial correlation to test for significant differences on these variables found no significant differences in written fluency, as measured by word count, from the beginning to the end of the first year. The end-year journals entries of the 1994-95 sixth-graders using portfolios and the 1993-94 control group (not using portfolios) were also compared to see if the portfolio group gained significantly more than the non-portfolio group in writing proficiency. The results indicated that there were no significant

differences in the proficiency of the non-portfolio group, however, the portfolio group ratings were significantly higher in proficiency at the end of the year ($p=.05$). Second year data will be analyzed at the end of the 1995-96 school year.

Several management tools were developed to assist students in maintaining their portfolios, staying on task, setting personal goals and evaluating their progress. The journals of the teacher and on-site researcher provided an on-going qualitative perspective of how well the students incorporated these techniques into their daily routine during the first year. Observed attitudinal changes and student achievements were recorded in these journals. First-year student portfolios were also independently evaluated on these tasks by the researchers. Materials evaluating student use of the Learning Logs, Time Management Sheets, and Goal Cards at the beginning of the first school year, at mid-year, and at the end of the year were rated 0 (no or insufficient information/missing data) to 4 (excellent management/ understands and completes task with high level of meaningful activity). Because the Friday Progress Report was introduced during the middle of the first year, the initial student samples of this instrument were compared only with the end of the school year pieces. Interjudge agreement within one rating point resulted in almost perfect agreement as to the level of student use. Student success with these tools was evaluated at the end of the first year to determine changes in student behavior and to determine which tools were successful, needed to be modified, or needed to be eliminated. If these tools are implemented during the Spring 1996 semester, entering and exit scores will be analyzed to determine student growth.

An analysis of the first year result showed significant improvement from pre to post test in the first group's use of the Time Management Sheets ($p = .001$), the Friday Progress Reports ($p = .05$) and the Goal Cards ($p = .05$). Analysis of the Learning Log showed a minor, although not significant, decrease in use. It appears that the students found the Time Management Sheet, Friday Progress Report and Goal Cards more meaningful and useful in directing their own learning. Qualitative journal entries and observations from the on-site researcher indicated that students' use of these management tools resulted in more on- task behavior and self-direction. However, during the Fall 1995 semester, only the Learning Log, which had been developed by the teacher prior to the portfolio project was being used on a daily basis in the classroom. The teacher

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

felt this helped student with very limited English language practice vocabulary being used in their mainstream classes.

Analysis of the teacher attitude survey data reflected changes from the onset of the project to mid year. A slight change indicated that by the middle of the first year the teacher thought it was slightly easier than anticipated to teach her students to be self-reflective, self-evaluative, and self-monitoring. She also indicated student's time in this country and language proficiency was slightly more important to the success of the portfolio project. It is apparent from the change in classroom routine during the second project year, the lack of English language proficiency was more important to this teacher then originally thought. The teacher's mid-year responses were indicative of the day-to-day challenges and minor frustrations with implementation. These concerns lead to modifications in the classroom procedures as teacher and researchers reflected on what seemed to be working and what needed to be changed.

By the end of the first school year the teacher attitude survey indicated that there had again been some shifts. The biggest change was that the teacher became much more positive than she had been mid-year about the ability of using portfolios to increase communication with the home (+4). This was due to involvement in a community activity which provided an opportunity to have the students share their portfolios with their families. The most notable change from the beginning to the end of the year was that in May the teacher indicated that the portfolio process was much more time consuming than traditional teaching (an increase of +4 on a 5 point scale), but she was still very willing (5) to spend an extra one to two hours a day if necessary to maintain the portfolio process. It was interesting to note that attitudes at the end of the first year more closely reflected those early attitudes held by the teacher which lead her to begin portfolio implementation. After working through the details and making changes, she was as positive in June about the value of portfolios for her students as she had been in September. However, during the second year, the academic and personal challenges caused her to temporarily set aside the use of portfolios for all students as she struggled to meet the most basic needs of her students. Because only one teacher is involved in this research, no generalizable conclusions can be made. However, this data suggests that as the teacher works through the process of implementing classroom portfolios, attitude changes have and are likely to continue to occur. It also suggests that for this teacher, as the classroom

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

structure became much more demanding, she reverted to more familiar strategies, and at mid-year was only beginning to reintroduce elements of the portfolio process.

One of the most interesting, but not unexpected findings was that to be successful, mentoring must provide a "win-win" situation for all parties involved. Students who were proud to be selected as "teachers" of their less accomplished peers quickly tired of not being engaged in their own learning. They also became frustrated by their mentees limited English language skills and some felt totally responsible for their assigned students. When the mentors perceived that training enhanced their own skills, and when they had adequate time to address their own learning goals, they were much more positive about the process.

Educational Implications: This study has investigated a management system for portfolio assessment of limited English proficient students in an ESL classroom. Many ESL program second language teachers often find themselves isolated when trying to develop new methods of instruction and assessment. It is extremely important that they are assisted in developing an effective management system to meet student needs. This is especially the case in portfolio assessment, which can be extremely demanding on the teacher's time and energy. This research has developed a framework intended to guide teachers as they embark on their journey towards authentic assessment.

The researchers have found that the portfolio management system implemented in this study has been largely successful in helping students become actively involved in planning, assessing and reflecting upon their own learning. However, to implement any change, the parties involved must be willing and able to takes the steps necessary to support that change. It also must be understood that portfolios are a process for the teacher as well as the students. Therefore, teachers must allow themselves the flexibility of moving in and out of the procedures as they feel the need. They have to give themselves time to develop a comfort level for the components that they feel enhances their educational program. These alterations should be viewed as natural adjustments in a growth process.

To successfully implement the portfolio model discussed in this paper the following key components should be considered:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- teacher demonstration of procedures and repeated practice by students
- weekly setting of goals by students
- engagement of students in daily planning and time management
- weekly assessment of progress by students
- periodic peer conferencing regarding process made in learning
- writing of reflective statements for pieces students have selected to include in their showcase portfolio.
- creating a win-win situations for students mentoring or helping their classmates

The careful selection of appropriate performance assessments also has strong educational significance. These procedures yielded additional insight into student thought processes as well as their academic and linguistic development. The portfolio process has great promise, not only as a management tool for constructivist classrooms, but also for empowering students to become decision makers as they make choices regarding their own learning. In our concern for molding life-long learners, the benefits of goal setting, reflection, and self-analysis cannot be underestimated.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Calfee, R., & Hiebert, E. (1987). The teacher's role in using assessment to improve learning. In E. E. Freeman (Ed.), **Assessment in the service of learning**. Proceedings of the 1987 ETS Invitational Conference (pp. 45-61). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Chamot, A., & O'Malley, M. (1994). **The CALLA Handbook. Reading**, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Collins, A., & Dana, T. (1993). Using portfolios with middle grades students. **Middle School Journal**. 20, 14-19.

Colvin, R. (1988, November 30). California researchers "accelerate" activities to replace remediation. **Education Week**, p. 6.

Cortez, S., & Lawver, D. (1993). Radical educational reform: reactions of teachers on the firing line in Northern Kentucky. Paper presented at the Mid-Western Educational Research Association Conference, Chicago, Illinois.

De Fina, Allan. (1992). **Portfolio assessment: Getting started**. NY: Scholastic.

Flood, J., & Lapp, D. (1989). Reporting reading progress: A comparison portfolio for parents. **The Reading Teacher**. **42**. 508-514.

Freeman, Y, & Freeman, D. (1991, January). Portfolio assessment: An exciting view of what bilingual children can do. **BEOutreach**. 6-7.

French, R. L. (1992). Portfolio assessment and LEP students. Paper presented at the Second National Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Student Issues, Washington, DC. (ED 349817).

Garcia, G. E. (1994). Assessing the literacy development of second-l language students: A focus on authentic assessment. In Spangenberg-Urbschat, K., & Pritchard, R. (eds.) **Kids come in**

EST COPY AVAILABLE

all languages: Reading instruction for ESL students. Newark, Del.: International Reading Association.

Glazer, S. M., & Brown, C. S. (1993). **Portfolios and beyond: Collaborative assessment in reading and writing.** Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.

Graves, D. (1992). The portfolios spread within the five teachers' s schools. Paper presented at the International Reading Association Convention, Orlando, FL.

Graves, D., & Sunstein, B. S. (1992). **Portfolio portraits.** Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Hamayan, E. V., Kwiat, J. A., & Perlman, R. (1985). **The identification and assessment of language minority students: A handbook for educators.** Arlington Heights, IL: Illinois Resource Center.

Hansen, J. (1992). Literacy portfolios emerge. **The Reading Teacher. 45** (8), 604-607.

Harlin, R., & Lipa, S. (1992). Training teachers to interpret portfolio assessment. Paper presented at the International Reading Association Conference, Orlando, Florida.

Herman, J. L., Aschabacher, P. R., & Winters, L. (1992). **A practical guide to alternative assessment.** Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Herman, J. L., & Winters, L. (1994). Portfolio research: A slim collection. **Educational Leadership, 52** (2), 48-58.

Hiebert, E. H., & Calfee, R. C. (1989). Advancing academic literacy through teachers' assessments, **Educational Leadership, 46** (7),50-54.

McCombs, B. L. (1991). Motivation and lifelong learning. **Educational Psychologist, 26** (2), 117-128.

Mills, R. P. (1989, December). Portfolios capture rich array to student performance. **The School Administrator**, 8-11.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Moya, S. S., & O'Malley, J. M. (1994). A portfolio assessment model for ESL. **Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students. 13**, 13-36.

Navarrete, C., Wilde, J., Nelson, C., Martinez, R., & Hargett, G. (1990, Summer). **Informal assessment in educational evaluation: Implications for bilingual education programs.** National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education Program Information Guide Series (No. 3). Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Newman, C., Smolen, L. & Lee, D.J. Jr. (1995) Implementation of portfolios in an ESL classroom. Presented at the Eastern Educational Research Association. Hilton Head, S.C.

Newman, C., Smolen, L. & Lee, D.J. Jr. (1995) First year analysis of portfolios in an ESL classroom. Presented at Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Newman, C., & Smolen, L. (1993). Portfolio assessment in our schools: Implementation, advantages, and concerns. **Mid-Western Educational Researcher. 6** (1), 28-32.

Newman, I., & Benz, C. (1991). **Qualitative-quantitative interactive continuum** (in press, SIU Press).

Newman, I., & Newman, C. (1994). **Conceptual statistics for beginners, 2nd ed**. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Paris, S. G., & Ayres, L. R. (1994). Becoming reflective students and teachers with portfolios and authentic assessment. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Pierce, L.V., Bass, C., Fagan, B. & Millet, F. (1995). Portfolio assessment: Collaboration counts! Paper presented at the 29th Annual TESOL Convention, Long Beach, CA.

Rief, L. (1992). **Seeking diversity**. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Rothman, R. (1988, October 26). Vermont plans to pioneer with ' work portfolios. **Education Week**, p. 1.

Routman, R. (1991). **Invitations**. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Russavage, P. M. (1992). Building credibility for portfolio assessment. **Literacy: Issues and Practices. 9**, 19-25.

Schunk, D. H. (1990). Goal setting and self-efficacy during self-regulated learning. **Educational Psychologist. 25** (1), 71-86.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Assessment for teaching: An initiative for the profession. **Phi Delta Kappan. 69**, 38-44.

Tierney, R. J., Carter, M. A., Desai, L. E. (1991). **Portfolio assessment in the reading-writing classroom.** Norwood, MA: Christopher Gordon.

Vacca, R. T., & Vacca, J. A. (1993). **Content area reading, 4th ed.** NY: Harper Collins.

Valencia, S. W. (1990). A portfolio approach to classroom reading assessment: The whys, whats and hows. **The Reading Teacher, 43**, 60-61.

van Kraayenoord, C. E., & Paris, S. G. (1992). Portfolio assessment: Its place in the Australian classroom. **Australian Journal of Language and Literacy. 15**, 93-104.

Vavrus, L. (1990). Put portfolios to the test. **Instructor. 100** (1), 48- 53.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). **Mind in society: Development of Higher Psychological Processes,** ed.M. Cole, S. Scribner, V. John-Steiner, and E. Souberman. Cambridgem MA, Harvard University Press.

Weeks, B., & Leaker, J. (1991). **Managing literacy assessment with young learners**. Evanston, IL: McDougal, Littell & Co.

Wiggins, G. (1989). A true test: Toward more authentic and equitable assessment . **Phi Delta Kappan. 70**, 703-713.

Winograd, P., Paris, S., & Bridge, C. (1991). Improving the assessment of literacy. **The Reading Teacher. 45** (2), 108-116.